



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Then, too, we are the next of kin to all the nations now at war; they are blood of our blood and bone of our bone. Not a soldier boy falls on any battlefield over yonder but the wail of sorrow in his home finds an echo at some American fireside, and these nations have a right to expect that we will remain the friend of all and be in position to play the part of a friend when a friend can aid.

Some nation must lift the world out of the black night of war into the light of that day when an enduring peace can be built on love and brotherhood, and I crave that honor for this nation. More glorious than any page of history that has yet been written will be the page that records our claim to the promise made to the peacemakers.

This is the day for which the ages have been waiting. For nineteen hundred years the gospel of the Prince of Peace has been making its majestic march around the world, and during these centuries the philosophy of the Sermon on the Mount has become more and more the rule of daily life. It only remains to lift that code of morals from the level of the individual and make it real in the law of nations, and ours is the nation best prepared to set the example. We are less hampered by precedent than other nations, and therefore more free to act. I appreciate the value of precedent. What higher tribute can I pay it than to say that it is as universal as the law of gravitation and as necessary to

stability? And yet the law of gravitation controls only inanimate nature—everything that lives is in constant combat with the law of gravitation. The tiniest insect that creeps upon the ground wins a victory over it every time it moves; even the slender blade of grass sings a song of triumph over this universal law as it lifts itself up toward the sun. So every step in human progress breaks the law of precedent. Precedent lives in the past—it relies on memory; because a thing never was, precedent declares that it can never be. Progress walks by faith and dares to try the things that ought to be.

This, too, is the leading Christian nation. We give more money every year to carry the Gospel to those who live under other flags than any other nation now living or that has lived. The two reasons combine to fix the eyes of the world upon us as the one nation which is at liberty to lead the way from the blood-stained methods of the past out into the larger and better day.

We must not disappoint the hopes which our ideals and achievements have excited. If I know the heart of the American people, they are not willing that this supreme opportunity shall pass by unimproved. No, the metropolitan press is not the voice of the nation; you can no more measure the sentiment of the peace-loving masses by the froth of the jingo press than you can measure the ocean's silent depths by the foam upon its waves.

CHRISTMAS LOGIC

By J. T. STOCKING

"Glory to God in the highest,
On earth peace, good will among men."

THAT is, "peace" *through* "good will among men." This song is not merely a bit of lilting sentiment; it is irrefragable logic. Jesus was the "Prince of Peace" in the Kingdom of God. His method of bringing peace was through creating "good will among men." And that is the only method that has yet been found that will bring peace and preserve it—whether it be industrial peace, economic peace, or international peace. The Prince of Peace found a cruel industrial order. Society was suffering from the very ills that plague this era of "big business." He purposed no "set of regulations," but he said: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." He found society caked, seamed, and stratified. He advocated no particular statutes, but he "taught them, saying": "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He was not a soap-box, pulpit, or platform agitator for any special legislation which should speedily change things. He knew that society could not be quieted like a crying child by a spoonful of legislation. He did not put His trust in "measures," but in a great principle, and that principle was *good will*.

There is no problem that grows out of the relations between men that would not be solved without delay if there were "good will among men." And there is not one of these problems that ever will be solved until there

is good will among men. All the laws and regulations that Congress and legislatures can put upon the books will not bring peace into our economic world unless people have a real concern for each other's welfare. All the military measures that army and navy leagues can conjure into existence, can frighten people into accepting, and compel Congressmen, through "pressure," to "come across" and support, all the courts for arbitration and conciliation and mediation, that those who put their reliance still on reason can assemble, will not of themselves bring peace. That will come only when there is a love for humanity and an interest in humanity that transcends national boundaries, and makes of patriotism something more and something nobler than local pride. Laws may bring about a "cessation of hostilities" for a time, but hostilities will not cease until *hostility* ceases. An armed truce is not peace. That comes only through "good will among men."

There is nothing spectacular about this method of bringing peace. There is nothing that tickles the ears of those who follow a sonorous, high-sounding phrase. There is nothing dashing or dazzling about this program. There is no crusading here to force or "enforce" anything. The method does not thrill with promise or prophecy of *instant* action or speedy transformation. It is the old slow, undramatic method which has been followed in every step that civilization has ever taken from the time when Cain murdered his brother.

There must be a new social conscience to right social wrongs, and there must be a new international conscience to right international wrongs. A writer in the *Forum* a few years ago said: "An employer is under no more financial obligation to his workmen after he has paid their current wages than they are to him or to a passer-by on the street whom they never saw." Another man of much the same school writes: "Every man and woman in society has one big duty: that is, to take care of his or her own self." He tries to relieve this teaching of something of its crassness by adding: "This is a social duty, . . . and the latter [social duty] is accomplished when the former is done." It is plain to all but the dullest and blindest today that such an attitude as these two men represent is the greatest enemy of industrial peace. Such an attitude has to go before we have any permanent guarantee of peace in the social order. These men are industrial pirates.

We are rapidly rising above such a creed in social ethics. But in national ethics we are slower in rising. Prevailing patriotism does not rise much above the idea that "every [nation] has one big duty to take care of her own self." This conception of our big duty to look out for No. 1—to be "for America, right or wrong," to have regard only for America's selfish interests—is a constant menace to peace. It is the creed of a national pirate. It is the kind of creed that tears up treaties into scraps and steps on the neck of the weak in the name of "Unser Gott." Such an idea of patriotism breeds distrust and suspicion. It is always arming for "defense." It is hypersensitive in the matter of "national honor." It lists at length the things in which "America could never submit to arbitration." There is no safety for any nation so long as it clings to this out-

law idea of patriotism. If this war teaches us anything, it should teach us that the fortunes of the nations are inseparably intertwined, and that no nation looks out for its own welfare who looks out only for its own welfare. Good will distributes our interests and guarantees peace.

There are loud and raucous voices saying that this philosophy won't work. It is all right to sing about "good will" at Christmas time, but it is too refined a sentiment for use in practical affairs. People who advocate it are "impractical," "dreamers," "silly," "spineless pacifists," and a "peril to the nation." It is easy to call names. It always has been. Hard-headed "practical" people of affairs called the Prince of Peace "crazy," a "blasphemer," and a peril to the throne of Cæsar. No one should be intimidated by a name. This brutal and lustful war, which has sickened the earth with smell and taste of blood, has struck faith and reason a blow which has made them blink. In the face of this orgy of hate it sometimes has seemed futile to preach the power of love and good will. But this shameful conflict will end some day soon. The bloody God of War will shut his dripping jaws, his disgusting maw distended with the bodies of too many men, because the chords in the hearts of the nations will be touched by the "angel of [their] better natures," and they will see that they ought to live together as comrades, not as foes.

We advocate the gospel of good will, not because it is a pretty sentiment, but because it is the only adequate gospel. Good will is the only "insurance" that nations can rely upon. No other foundation can be laid for peace than that which was laid over nineteen centuries ago. Christmas logic is the only logic for the situation.

THE DANGER OF MILITARISM IN CHINA

By A. WARBURTON DAVIDSON, Chungking (West China).

A RECENT issue of *The National Review* (China) contained a long article by "A Chinese Student" on "The History of China's Army," which shows clearly that Young China's hope for the future is in militarism, and that the recent Chino-Japanese crisis has given a great impetus to the military spirit all over China.

At the outset the writer refers to the anxiety which exists "as to what part my people are to play in the world's history." This is seen in the high respect and enthusiasm displayed by the people at large in the new development in military affairs and in the recent revival of the President's interest, as evidenced by his decision to form a nucleus "model army." These new developments are of great significance, for they indicate that "our martial spirit is not quite dead, but only needs awakening."

It is often said that China is not a military race—and perhaps now she is not—but "A Chinese Student" points out that this has not always been so, and he gives several illustrations from history to prove his point. "In the time of feudalism" (770-221 B. C.), he says, "every man had, during some part of the year, to practice the art of fighting, and a long sword was the distinction of a gen-

tleman. Confucius himself wore that weapon all the way in his travels, although it is doubtful whether he ever made use of it." "After the year 221 B. C. feudalism was abolished, and the Emperor sent his general (Men Tien) to the northern frontier with an army of 300,000. This is perhaps the first time China had a standing army." He then refers to two glorious periods in the history of his country

"which a Chinese can never forget." "The great Emperor Wu-Ti, of the House of Han (296 B. C., 220 A. D.), began his military career 128 B. C., and before that he had already gained a decisive victory over the Huingnu (probably the Turks of later date). With a view to turn their flank, he conquered the northern part of Korea, and formed alliances with those races who lived in what is now known as Ili, and the new territory. It was this same Emperor who conquered the whole of the Chinese Empire which lies south of the Yangtze.

The policy of the T'ang Dynasty (A. D. 618-922) was much less warlike than that of Han, but under that dynasty China conquered Korea, and drove out the Tartars in the north, and united under the direct rule of central government the States which then existed in the south. Our influence was recognized by Persia, India, Indo-China, and Japan, especially by Persia. Romance and bravery are not wanting in our history. But alas! good fortune deserted us after